

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-22 over the prior art, and allowed Claim 14. Claim 10, it may be noted, has been withdrawn from consideration in this application as being directed to a non-elected invention.

With regard to the rejections of the claims over the prior art, Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. patent application 2002/0038299 (Zernik, et al.). Claims 12, 13, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Zernik, et al; and Claims 4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Zernik, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,182,090 (Peairs).

Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 7, 11, 16 and 18 be amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. In addition, Applicants are herein canceling Claim 10 from this application, and expressly reserve the right to file a divisional application for claims directed to the subject matter of Claim 10.

For the reasons discussed below, Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-22, as presented herewith, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-22, and to allow these claims.

The present invention relates to methods and procedures for determining and displaying icons representing text files. As explained in detail in the present application, this is done to help users find data files in which they are interested.

In the invention, an extractor is used to determine the contents of a word file by examining the words therein, and an icon is associated with the text file on the bases of weighted values given to different topics found in the file as the result of that word search. That icon can then be displayed, providing a searcher with a quick, graphical indication of the contents of the file.

Zernik, et al. also generally relates to facilitating the presentation of data. With the procedure disclosed in Zernik, et al, web pages are analyzed to identify their content, these pages are then associated with one or more static categories, and an image can be displayed representing one of these categories.

There are a number of important differences between the present invention and the procedure disclosed in Zernik, et al. For example with the present invention, icons are selected for the text files on the basis of weighted values assigned to topics associated with the test files. These topics, in turn, are determined by an examination of the words in the file.

Zernik, et al uses a different procedure. A signature is identified for a web page, and these signatures are associated with one or more predetermined categories. Weights are assigned to each category depending on how close the category matches the signature, and an icon is assigned to the text file on the basis of these weighted categories.

Thus, while Zernik, et al discloses the use of weighted values, in Zernik, et al those weighted values are given to predetermined categories, while the present invention gives the weighted values to the determined topics of the text files.

This procedure of the present invention is of utility because, in comparison to Zernik, et al, the present invention is better able to match icons with the actual content of the text files.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 11, 16 and 18 clearly describe differences between the claims and the prior art. In particular, Claims 1 and 7 describe an extractor for determining one or more topics of a text file from or by an examination of words in the file, and a selector or module for selecting one of a plurality of icons to represent the text file on the basis of weighted values assigned to the determined topics.

Claim 11, similarly, describes a semantic content extractor for identifying one or more topics associated with a file based on an examination of words in the file, and a matcher to create an icon based on weighted values assigned to those topics. Claims 16 and 18 both describe the steps of determining one or more topics of a file by examining words in the file; and on the basis of weighted values assigned to those topics, selecting one of the icons in a database to represent the file.

The other references of record have been reviewed and these other references, whether they are considered individually or in combination, also do not teach or suggest the use of weighted topics to select icons to represent text files, as described in Claims 1, 7, 11, 16 and 18.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7, 11, 16 and 18 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is anticipated by or is obvious in view of the prior art. Accordingly, Claims 1, 7, 11, 16 and 18 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-6 and 20-22 are dependent from and are allowable with Claim 1, and Claims 8 and 9 are

dependent from Claim 7 and are allowable therewith. Also, Claims 12 and 13 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 11; and Claims 17 and 19 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claims 16 and 18, respectively. Consequently, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection of Claims 4, 12, 13, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 16-22.

With respect to Claim 15, the above-discussed rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed because the prior art does not disclose or suggest the step of creating a composite icon containing many topics, as described in Claim 15. In particular, Peairs discloses a procedure for using multiple icons to represent a page. Peairs, however, does not describe or suggest creating icons containing many topics that are themselves attached to files based on a word content of the file.

Zernik, et al, as previously mentioned, associates icons with text files, but this association is not based on topics attached to the word file. Thus, even the combination of Zernik and Peairs fails to disclose or suggest creating composite icons of the type described in Claim 15. The Examiner is, hence, respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 15 and to allow this claim.

It is noted that the changes asked for herein to Claims 1, 7, 11, 16 and 18 only emphasized features already described in the claims. For example, Claim 1 presently describes selecting an icon to represent a text file, and the amendments requested herein describe in more detail the procedure used to select that icon. It is thus believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102, and the rejection of Claims 4, 12, 13, 15, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-22. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy